

Massimiliano Franci

CAMNES

(Center for Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies),
Florence

EGYPTO-SEMITIC COMPARISON: SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON BILABIALS AND DENTALS RELATIONSHIP

Abstract: Starting from an analysis of the Afroasiatic lexicon of Anatomy and Physiological Functions and of Physical Environment, Spontaneous Vegetation and Wild Animals, the author gives further details on bilabial and dental Afroasiatic phonemes, trying to underline the points in common between the three main theoretical Schools and the deeply differences (as in the case of the Egyptian Pharyngeal Voiced). This will be useful not only for Afroasiatic linguistics, but also for Egypto-Semitic lexical comparison.

Keywords: Afroasiatic, bilabial phonemes, dental phonemes, Diakonoff's School, *neure Komparatistik*, Egypto-Semitic comparison

In the Egypto-Semitic Comparison the main problem is to define clear and not problematic correspondences. This is not always simple to do because of the characteristic of ancient Egyptian Phonetic System, that (if compared to Semitic), for some scholars, has not dentals fricative and emphatics phonemes (but it shows palatalized phonemes),¹ which are attested in Afroasiatic and therefore they should have had a different evolution in Ancient Egyptian.² In the reconstruction of Afroasiatic Phonological System, some assumptions are used (not always agreed): (a) the Semitic Phonological System is more archaic than Berber and Egyptian, as well as the others branch and so more conservative,³ (b) within one of the Afroasiatic linguistic families, at least in one language all the ancient phonological system is attested⁴ (c) the Afroasiatic Phonological

¹ See Conti 1978: 20; Conti 1980: 30.

² See Loprieno 1995:31-32.

³ See Rössler 1964:199-216 and Voigt 2002: 272.

⁴ So at the base of the Common Semitic there is all the phonological inventory of Arabic and at the base of Afroasiatic there is all the inventory of Chadic plus some Cushitic phonemes

System should have a triads series,⁵ (d) the phonetic incompatibility theory leads to discover, especially in Egyptian, new phonemes,⁶ (e) whether the Egyptian was a Semitic language or not, every analysis starts from the assumption that Ancient Egyptian is more innovative than Semitic,⁷ and Cushitic,⁸ justifying in this way the great reduction of Afroasiatic phonemes in Egyptian,⁹ (f) following some scholars - in a different way respect to the Diakonoff's School¹⁰ - the distinction between the fricative series and the plosive considered all affricate,¹¹ it is not completely proved, if not in particular cases as the labial fricative *f*, because each of these could be a secondary phonetic realization;¹² and last (g) the Afroasiatic Phonetic System seems to be equal to the Semitic one.¹³ These theoretical premissis invite to make some consideration, in particular on the Bilabials and Dentals phonemes, about Correspondences and Phonetic Problems in the Lexicon of Anatomy and Physiological Functions and in the Lexicon of Physical Environment, Spontaneous Vegetation and Wild Animals.

Bilabials and Labiodental

The hypothetical existence of Afroasiatic emphatic bilabial **p̥* seems proved by the Semitic correspondences with the Egyptian labiodental *f*,¹⁴ by its attestation in Berber,¹⁵ by the correspondences between Chadic and Omotic.¹⁶ But until today its presence in Afro-asiatic phonological system it is not completely

(labialized). This axiom is still dangerous because it leads also to a large uncontrolled increase in the number of proto-phonemes; on this aporia see Hayward 2000:94, 98 and note 34.

⁵ See mainly Rössler 1971: 277, Voigt 2002:267-273.

⁶ His theory was used for the Egyptian by Rössler 1971. See after Roquet 1973:108-117; Petraček 1988:371-377; criticized by Takács 1999a: 322-332; Takács 2000:352-354.

⁷ Even the study of Rössler 1971 starting from the idea, considering the Egyptian a Semitic language, that the its phonological system reduced the more wide Semitic system: Semitic dentals and affricates (*t*, *ʃ*, *ʒ*), merged in the Egyptian *d* (in the rosslerian's system *ʔ*), see Voigt 2002:271, and the development of **d*, **d̥*, **d̥z*, **d̥z̥* in the Egyptian *ʃ*, see Voigt 2002:272. See Takács 1999a:271.

⁸ See Takács 1999ab:395.

⁹ In some examples six phonemes become one, see Hayward 2000:95.

¹⁰ See Diakonoff 1988:34; see also Blažek 1988:204; last Takács 1999a:266-270.

¹¹ See Voigt 2002:273.

¹² As Hebrew affricate.

¹³ See last Takács 1999a:265. We emphasize the high presence of phonemes emphatic or Pharyngealized, which are attested in the most recent branches of the Afroasiatic family, for centuries in contact with Arabic, they may have been influenced by the Arabic too, see Kossmann 1997: 6 that emphasized that the phonemes *t*, *ʃ* and *h* are Arabic loans, and see p. 15. See for a similar situation Haruna 1995:138-162. On similar and possible influences especially in the last millennium C.E. see Titov 1991:158.

¹⁴ See Voigt 2002:271.

¹⁵ Hypothesis of the Russian's School, see Militarev 1976.

¹⁶ See Diakonoff 1988:35.

accepted.¹⁷ The differentiation of the Afroasiatic **f* from **p* is confirmed by Egypto-Chadic correspondences,¹⁸ even if this phonetic opposition in the others Afroasiatic branches was lost. So, it is possible to reconstruct the plosive voiceless **p*, the voiced **b*, and the fricative **f*.

In the Egypto-Semitic comparison the Bilabials show regular correspondences:

Common Semitic (C.S.) **p* ~ Egyptian *p*: Akkadian *tapīhu* “drinking vessel (?)”, Egyptian *tp* “head”; C.S. *PANW, “face”, -PNUW- “volgersi”, Egyptian *pn^ʿ* “turn upside down”, *pn^ʿn^ʿ* “turn over and over”,¹⁹ compared by Militarev and Kogan with Cushitic, Aungi *fen* “face”, Oromo *funnān* “nose”, Western Chadic, Angas *pan* “guidare avanti”, Berber, Ahaggar *ā-funfan* “nose”;²⁰ C.S. *KAPP-, “curved hand”, Egyptian *kp* “paw”/Egyptian *kf* “make captures”,²¹ Western Chadic **paka* “hand”; C.S. *ʿAPAR- “land”, Egyptian *p3^ʿ.t* “(irrigabile) land”; Akkadian *šurpu* “burning enchantment”, Ugaritic *šnpt* “burning offer”, Ugaritic *šrp*, Egyptian *s3pt* “lotus leaf”; C.S. *PARY-, “fruit”, Egyptian *pri* “fruit”, “seed”, Cushitic, Beja *fār* “flower”, Western Chadic, Hausa *furē* “tree flower”; C.S. *PAR-?, “Onager”,²² Egyptian *pry* “ferocious bull”; Hebrew *ʾeproah* “little bird”, Gees *farḥ*, Arabic *farḥ*, Egyptian *p3^ʿt* “quail”; C.S. *KANAP-, “wing”, Egyptian *k3pw* “Bittern”; Gees *fālfal* “mole”, Egyptian *pnw* “mouse”, Low Eastern Cushitic, Oromo *fuli²-ō* “mouse”, Southern Cushitic, Rift Qwadza *pala-tiko* “mouse”, Eastern Chadic, bidiya *pa^ʿila* “a kind of mouse”.

C.S. **b* ~ Egyptian *b*: C.S. *ʿA-BIL- “dry”, Egyptian *ib* (metathesis) “be thirsty”; C.S. *GARAB- “scabies”, Akkadian and Syriac “leprosy”, Egyptian *h3bb* “crokedness”; C.S. *GABU-H-²³ “bald”, Egyptian *gb* “lack (of something)”; C.S. *-BKIY- “to cry”, Egyptian *bgi* “be weary”, Cushitic afar *bog* “to cry”; C.S. *NAYAB “tooth”, Egyptian *ibh* “tooth”, Berber *ennab* “canine tooth”; C.S. *ʿ- AQIB-, “calcaneus”, “animal hoof”, Egyptian, *kb-h* “foot”,²⁴ Egyptian *tbw* (< **kb*) “sole of foot”, Eastern Cushitic **kob*- “sandal”, Western Chadic, Hausa *kùbùtai* “slipper”, Central Chadic, Logone *kābē* “hoof of animal”; C.S. **gabib*-

¹⁷ See Takács 1999ab:395, and Takács 1999a:266. Despite its presence in the Afroasiatic, although they accept the attestation in Chadic, Orel –Stolbova 1995:16. Stolbova stresses that this phoneme belongs to the proto Chadic phonological system but not to the proto Afroasiatic, see Stolbova 1996:20.

¹⁸ Greenberg 1954:295-302, that suggests the presence of a phoneme /^mb/, on its nature see Greenberg 1965:88-92. Already against this hypothesis Illič-svityč 1966:9-34.

¹⁹ On reduplication of the root see Franci 2010:97-100.

²⁰ See Militarev - Kogan 2000:215.

²¹ On the suffix ʿ see Franci 2010:90-92.

²² On the suffix ʿ see Franci 2010:95-96.

²³ On the suffix *h* see Franci 2010:95.

²⁴ On the suffix *h* see Franci 2010:89-90.

“land”, Akkadian *gabibu*, Arabic *ḡabib-*, Egyptian *gbb* “land”, Cushitic, Somali *gof* “cultivated field in the bush”, Central Chadic **g(v)b-* “field”, Eastern Chadic **gab-* “clay”; Ugaritic *dbb* “ocean”, Egyptian *i-db* “river bank”, Afroasiatic **dob-* “water”; Akkadian *nabaʿu(m)* “type of reed mat”, Egyptian *nbit* “reed”; Akkadian *lābišu* “a plant”, Egyptian *nbs* “Ziziphus jujuba”; Akkadian *barraqītu* “a plant”, Geez *bālāq* “fragrant tree”, Geez *baqalt* “date palm”, Sudarabic *bql* “plant”, Egyptian *bzk* “moringa arabica”; Geez *bəḥe/bih* “hippopotamus”, Egyptian *ḥzb* “hippopotamus”, Eastern Cushitic, Iraqw *hawewé* “hippopotamus”; Akkadian *bukum* “a bird”, Egyptian *bk* “hawk”, Akkadian *būnum* “a bird”, Egyptian *bnw* “heron”, “phoenix”.

Aporias

Beside the regular correspondences, it’s possible to identify the so called occasional, seemingly irregular correspondences, which the latest studies consider acceptable,²⁵ for example in Ancient Egyptian is usual accepted the alternation of *b* and *p*:²⁶

C.S. **p* ~ Egyptian *b*: C.S. **PALG-*, “watercourse”, “stream, ditch”, Egyptian *bzg* “thick of fluid”; C.S. **PĪL-*, “elephant”, Egyptian *z̄bw* (metathesis) “elephant”, Berber, Tuareg *elu* “elephant”, Cushitic, Galla *arba* “elephant”, Eastern Cushitic **ʿarb-* “elephant”, Central Chadic **arp-* “elephant”, Eastern Highland Cushitic, Burji *ʿarb-a* “elephant”;²⁷ Hebrew *sārāp* “poisonous snake”, Egyptian *s̄bt* “colored snake”.

C.S. **b* ~ Egyptian *p* correspondence considered occasional but acceptable:²⁸ Geez *ḥənbərt* “navel”, Egyptian *ḥp̄z* “navel”, Cushitic, Agaw and Shamir *ḥərbir* “navel”; Central Chadic **hif-* “navel”; C.S. **BIRK-*, “knee”, Egyptian *p̄zg* “to kneel”, *p̄zd* “kneecap”, “knee”; C.S. **ṬABY-*, “gazzelle”, Egyptian *tp̄iw* “gazzelle”.

The first case (C.S. **p* ~ Egyptian *b*) could be one attestation of the neutralization of the voiced plosive with the passage of Egyptian *b* > *p*. According to some scholars both these confusing correspondences are caused by the fact that the Egyptian *b* was fricative [β] more than plosive, a phoneme still attested in Coptic.²⁹

²⁵ See Takács 1999a: 283-287.

²⁶ See Westerndorf 1962: 23, n. 37. Takács suggests a derivation from Afroasiatic *p/f*, see Takács 1999a:284-286.

²⁷ See Cohen 1969²:170, n° 372. See Takács 1999a: 51. See also Eastern Cushitic, Dhaasanac *ʿārab*, Tosco 2001, :575. However I must emphasize the probable relationship of the Semitic term with the Egyptian *bz* “leopardo”. Recently Militarev –Kogan 2005:227-229.

²⁸ See Takács 1999a:287.

²⁹ See Satzinger 1997:29.

The Egyptian Labiodental *f*

The origin of the Egyptian *f* is interpreted in two different ways: (a) phonematization of a variety of *p*;³⁰ (b) an autonomous Afroasiatic phoneme.³¹ In the Semitic language, *f* is just a variety sound of Common Semitic **p*, in the comparison it corresponds both to Egyptian *p* and *f*. In the Egyptian vocabulary *p* is attested in more words than *f*, probably as a result of a state control on the language in a historical period when the court was in Low Egypt, close to the Semitic area, and likely the phonematization of *f* is a High Egypt phenomenon on the same way of palatalization.³² In fact during the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, the passage *p* > *f* is attested, but, according to Roccati, it could have been caused even by some graphic phenomenon.³³

This fact leads us to a historical problem on the Bilabials in Afroasiatic, because Ancient Egyptian belongs to the three-phonetic Afroasiatic branch **p ~ f ~ b/*, together with Chadic e Southern Cushitic,³⁴ opposite to the bi-phonetic branch **p ~ b/*, composed by Semitic,³⁵ Omotic, Berber,³⁶ and the Cushitic.³⁷ Which is the innovative one? Greenberg suggested that the Semitic bi-phonetic system is more innovative, merging two Proto-phonemes in one.³⁸ Moscati suggested a second hypothesis: the only Common Semitic phoneme was **p* that corresponds not only to *p* but even to Egyptian, Chadic, and Cushitic *f*, considering an innovation the Egyptian spit of **p* in two different phonemes.³⁹

The comparison shows that Egyptian preserved both two original Afroasiatic phonemes **p* and **f*, as in some branch of Cushitic, in Central and Western Chadic, differently to Berber and Semitic,⁴⁰ where is accepted just a Common **p*, that in Southern Semitic became *f*.

C.S. **p* ~ Egyptian *f*: C.S. **ʔANP*- “nose”, Egyptian *nft* “breath, wind”, *nʃz* “blow (out of nose)”; Arabic *sāfa* “to smell”, Aramaic *šayyep* “to blow”, Egyptian **sf* “nose”, Eastern Cushitic **šuf*- “to smell”, Western Chadic **saf*-

³⁰ Cohen 1969²:166-167.

³¹ Greenberg 1958: 295-302; see also Djakonoff 1988: 35.

³² See Crevatin 1985: 130.

³³ See Roccati 2000: 2: 4-5.

³⁴ See also Takács 1999a: 395, where he emphasizes that this triad “...is an archaism preserved in same form (...) but lost in most of the other Cushitic Languages, also in Semitic and Berber...”.

³⁵ In Southern Semitic the Common *p* became *f*; the Ethiopian *p* seems to be used just in Greek loanwords.

³⁶ Where the Bilabials triad is *m, b e p*, see Greenberg 1958: 295.

³⁷ See Svolacchia 1987: 190.

³⁸ Greenberg 1958:296- 299.

³⁹ Moscati 1969, §§72-73.

⁴⁰ See Orel 1995: 144.

“wind”, Central Chadic **saf-* “to breathe”;⁴¹ Arabic *kafal-* “back”, Amharic *ǧarba* “back”, Egyptian *kfʒ* “hinder part (of bird)”;⁴² Hebrew *paḥado* “buttock”, Arabic *faḥid* “buttocks”, Egyptian *ḥpdw* “buttocks”;⁴³ C.S. *HUP-N- “fist”, Egyptian *ḥf-ʿ* “fist”; Akkadian *niqiptu* “shrub”, Egyptian *ndft* “a tree”; Akkadian *pagû(m)* “monkey”, Egyptian *gf* (*cercopithecus ethiops*) “long-tailed monkey”, il proto-Chadic *[?i]puki- “monkey”.

Dentals

There is no problem in the reconstruction of Afroasiatic Dentals.⁴⁴ The dental triad **t*, **d*, **t̥* is well preserved in Semitic, Berber (where the emphatic corresponds to the voiced *d*, but in the double realization to the voiceless *-tt-*), in Cushitic; but it was lost in Egyptian (where apparently the passage **t* > *d* took place), and in Chadic, with the only exception in the North Bauchi language, where **t̥* is attested whereas in the others languages it becomes *t*.⁴⁵

In the comparison the correspondences between Egypto-Semitic dentals are quite regular:

C.S. **t* ~ Egyptian *t*: C.S. *-TYIN- “to urinate” and C.S. *TAYN-(AT-) “urine”, Egyptian *šnit* “storm”, variant *šnyt*, *šnʿ*, proto Southern Cushitic **sintyʿa* “urine”; C.S.*MAT-N- “tendon”, Egyptian *mt* “vessel, duct, muscle”; C.S. *ŠAP-AT- “lip”, Egyptian *sp.t* “lip”, Cushitic Proto Rift **š(v) fi* “lips”;⁴⁶ C.S. *LAḤY-(AT-), “cheek”, Arabic and Gees “beard”, Egyptian *ḥn.t* (metathesis) “face”; Akkadian *šaḥātu(m)* “part of land”, Egyptian “marshland” *šḥt*; Akkadian *aḥjtu* “river bank”, Ugaritic *ʾaḥ* “coast”, Egyptian *iḥmt* “river bank”; Ugaritic *mrym* “hill”, Gees *mareṯ* “land”, “dust”, Egyptian *mʒwt* “new land”; C.S. *TILL-, “hill”, *tʒ* “land”, proto Cushitic **ter-/tir-* “dust”, Western Omotic, Nao *туру* “land”, Southern Omotic, Hamar *tore* “land”, Western Chadic, Bole-Tangale **tar-* “farm”; Gees *satt* “papyrus”, “reed”, Egyptian *swt* “scirpus” (water rush), Southern Cushitic, West Rift **caw-*, Iraqw *cawo* “bulrushes”; Ugaritic *tnn* “primordial dragon”, Gees *təro* “bull”, proto Southern Cushitic **tal-* “lioness”, Egyptian *tʒ* “lion”; C.S. *N-ŪB-(AT-), “bee”, Egyptian *bīṯ* “bee”.

C.S. **d* ~ Egyptian *d*: C.S. *DAM, “blood”, Egyptian *i-dm* “red linen”; C.S. *QADQAD “top of the head”, Egyptian *kd* “pot”; Gees *dawal* “country, border”, Tigre *dawal* “district, country”, Egyptian *wdrṯ* “region”; Ugaritic *dbb* “ocean”, Egyptian *i-db* “river bank”; C.S. *DAT-ʔ-, “fresh grass”, Egyptian

⁴¹ Takács 1997: 225.

⁴² Cohen 1969²: 114, n° 178; see also Takács 1997: 231; and Takács 1999a: 66.

⁴³ Lacau 1970: 79.

⁴⁴ See Takács 1999a: 266-267.

⁴⁵ See Stolbova 1996: 35. Nevertheless the passage of initial *t-* to *t̥* in presence of *b* leads to make some reflections on the real attestation of the voiceless emphatic in Chadic.

⁴⁶ For all Cohen 1969²: 139, n° 289. On Egyptian word see Lacau 1970: 54-56.

dyt “papyrus plant”; C.S. *ṬIQD-, “almond tree”, Egyptian *ḳdt.t* (metathesis) “a conifer”; C.S. *DABY- “bear”, Egyptian *db* “hyppopotamus”; Geez *dagdæg* “rooster”, Arabic *dağāğ* “domestic bird”, Egyptian *dgyt* “a bird”.

The correspondence of Ancient Egyptian with the Semitic Dental Emphatic *ṭ

The relationship of Egyptian with the Semitic Dental Emphatic *ṭ is controversial, because according to the theory of Rössler and *neure Komparatistik* the only acceptable correspondence is C.S. *ṭ ~ Egyptian *d*, denying completely the correspondence C.S. *d* ~ Egyptian *d*,⁴⁷ while Cohen suggested that “...les correspondances donnent *t*, rarement *d*...”.⁴⁸ Nevertheless some scholars don’t assume such categorical vision,⁴⁹ underlining the solidity of this correspondence, probably due to the fact that the only distinctive feature could be the “voiced”:⁵⁰

<i>Common Semitic</i>	<i>Egyptian</i>	
/ṭ/	/d/	/t/
[PLOSIVE]	[PLOSIVE]	[PLOSIVE]
[DENTAL]	[DENTAL]	[DENTAL]
[VOICELESS]	[VOICED]	[VOICELESS]
[EMPHATIC]	-	[ASPIRATED]

The correspondences show that both *t* and *d* correspond in the same percentage to the dental emphatic.⁵¹

C.S. *ṭ ~ Egyptian *t*:⁵² Akkadian di Mari *ṭapī-ḥu* “pot”, Egyptian *tp* “head”; C.S. *MAṬAR- “pioggia”, Egyptian *mtr* “acqua”,⁵³ C.S. *aṭar- “incense”, Egyptian **ntyw* “myrrh”; Geez *ṭasn* “thyme”, Egyptian *nstyw* (metathesis) “shrub (alkanna tinctoria)”; C.S. *ḥaṭṭ- “stick, branch”, Egyptian *ḥt* “albero”, Eastern Cushitic, Saho-Afar *ḥaḍ-a* “tree”, proto Chadic **k-d* “tree”; C.S. *ṬIQD-, “almond tree”, Egyptian *ḳdt.t* (metathesis) “a conifer”.

Aporias

C.S. *ṭ ~ Egyptian *d*: *ŠIT-, “buttocks”, Egyptian *šd* “vulva” (loanword?), Cushitic, Burji *suutoo*, Berber, Nefusi *eddist* “belly” and Figuig **ds* “belly”.

⁴⁷ Rössler 1971: 272-274 e p. 285.

⁴⁸ Cohen 1969²: 155.

⁴⁹ See Diakonoff 1988: 35, for whom AA *ṭ > Eg. *d*. Loprieno emphasizes AA *ṭ, *ṣ > Eg. *d*, see Loprieno 1995: 32.

⁵⁰ See Diakonoff 1988: 35-36; Loprieno 1995: 32.

⁵¹ See Loprieno 1977: 131.

⁵² See Cohen 1969²: 155; see also Orel – Stolbova 1995: XVIII-XIX.

⁵³ See Fronzaroli 1965: 139-140; see also Orel – Stolbova 1995: 379 n° 1747.

C.S. *d ~ Egyptian t: C.S. *dlh “bava”, Egyptian t3h “bava, umore”; C.S. *GILD “skin”, Egyptian hnt, “skin”, h3w “skin”, Southern Cushitic *gn “skin”, Chadic, kera gòlgò “skin of animal”; Akkadian s̄adu “meadow”, Egyptian stt “field”.

The aporias within a regular system of correspondences, as in the case of the voiced and the voiceless, were seen as consequence of the Ancient Egyptian tendency to the neutralization of the voiced plosive, that shifted the phonetic relationship from voiceless/voiced to aspirated/voiceless. But we can suggest one example not related with this process, C.S. *ŠIT-, “buttocks”, Egyptian šd “vulva”, Cushitic, Burji *suutoo*, Berber, Nefusi *eddist* “belly” and Figuig *ds “belly”, where the Afroasiatic documentation shows the regularity of this oscillation.

Hard to explain the correspondence C.S. *t ~ **Egyptian s**, attested as irregular C.S. *ṬĪN-(AT-), “clay”, Egyptian sin “clay”, Eastern Chadic, Somray *siña* “clay”;⁵⁴ as well as these comparison with the relationship C.S. *t ~ Egyptian 0, likely evidence of a common Afroasiatic bilitteral root, extended by a suffix: Geez *salit* “sesame oil”, Arabic *salīt* “sesame oil”, Egyptian š3w “coriander”, Eastern Cushitic, Saho-Afar *salīt*, Somali *salid*.

The Problem of the Egyptian Pharyngeal Voiced ʕ

After Rössler’s statement about the correspondence C.S. *t ~ Egyptian *d*, the next step was trying to define the real phonetic value of the Egyptian *d*. Starting from the idea that the Egyptian ʕ was incompatible with dentals and alveolar, at least in the Pyramid texts and in a different way than the Semitic one, Rössler suggested that its real phonetic value should be found exactly within those phonemes whereby the Egyptian ʕ is incompatible, dental and/or alveolar, and it was the voiced counterpart of voiceless *t and emphatic *t. So Rössler reconstructed for the grampheme <ʕ> the phonetic value [d], that in comparison should correspond to the Common Semitic *d, *ḏ, *z, *ḏ;⁵⁵ an unusual correspondence that Loprieno interpreted as the passage of Afroasiatic Apicals and Interdentals *d, *z e *ḏ in the Egyptian ʕ, through an intermediate stage with pharyngealized lateral: *d, *z e *ḏ > * : > ʕ.⁵⁶ Others like Zeidler suggested the presence of a third phoneme *d*, near <t> /t/ and <d> /t’/, without a proper

⁵⁴ Already Cohen 1969²: 142, n° 297. Note the Egyptian word *sint* “clay seal”. Orel and Stolbova didn’t accept this comparison, see Orel – Stolbova 1995: 475 n° 2249, and they suggested a comparison of the Egyptian word with Western Chadic, *sin- “field”, Central Chadic *sin- “field”, Eastern Chadic *sinya- “land”. But also we should consider the comparison with the Egyptian word *dni-tni* “dry land” (AEO 54).

⁵⁵ Rössler 1971: 273, 276-277, 285-286, 288, 291-293. Against the theories of Rössler see Conti 1976: 50-55; and Ward 1985: 232-248. For a critical analysis see Takács 1999a: 333-393.

⁵⁶ Loprieno 1995: 31.

grapheme, that in the Middle Kingdom took a pharyngeal articulation $\text{ʕ} / \text{ʔ}$.⁵⁷ The theory is yet ambivalent as the following example indicates C.S. *DARDAR- “thistle”, Egyptian ʕr “reed pen”, near to another comparison Ugaritic ʕrʕr “Tamarisk”, Hebrew ʕrʕr , Syriac ʕarō , Arabic ʕarʕar , Akkadian *aru(m)* “branch, frond” of Tamarisk; Geez bəʕr “reed leaf”. Could they be interpreted as dialectal differences?⁵⁸

Fricative Interdentals

The Fricative Dentals or Interdental are Semitic characteristic phonemes and their relationship with Egyptian seems similar to the evolution that these had in some Semitic Languages. The C.S. * t usually corresponds to Egyptian s , and C.S. * d both to the Egyptian z , and d ,⁵⁹ even if there are some uncertainties:⁶⁰ C.S. * d ~ Egyptian z , C.S. *DIB- “wolf”, Egyptian $\text{z}b$ “jackal”,⁶¹ Cushitic, Beja *diib* “wolf”, Eastern Chadic * ʒabiy - “Hyena”, Omotic * zobb -;⁶² to which we can add, considering the alveolar oscillation, the example (C.S. * d ~ Egyptian s) C.S. *DIRĀ ʕ -, “arm”, Egyptian h-sr “arm”, Western Chadic * sar “arm, hand”.⁶³ Hard to explain the relationship * d ~ Egyptian t attested in the example C.S. *-HDĪY- “to pant”, in Arabic “to rave”, Egyptian ht “call out”, explicable, attested the word to the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, by the neutralization of the opposition between voiced and voiceless, reconstructing an original * hd , and leading that comparison to the correspondence with C.S. * d .⁶⁴

With the Semitic Fricative Interdental Voiceless Ancient Egyptian shows different seemingly irregular correspondences:⁶⁵

C.S. * t ~ Egyptian t , C.S. *DAT- ʔ -, “fresh grass”, Egyptian *dyt* “papyrus plant”; C.S. *BURĀT- ʔ -, “juniper”, Egyptian *bʒt* “bush”, “wisp (of corn)”, attested in Chadic Cushitic.⁶⁶

C.S. * t ~ Egyptian ʃ : 12. C.S. *-TYIN- “to urinate” e C.S. *TAYN-(AT-) “urine”, Egyptian *ʃnit* “storm”, variant *ʃnyt*, *ʃn* ʕ , proto Southern Cushitic **sintyʔa* “urine”; C.S. **npt* “saliva”, Egyptian *iʃf* “saliva”,⁶⁷ 126. C.S. *NAYT- ʔ -, “lion”,

⁵⁷ Zeidler 1992: 206-210.

⁵⁸ On the same way Schenkel 1993: 137-149; and also Loprieno 1994: 372.

⁵⁹ On d see Cohen 1969²: 158-159; Ward 1961: 37, n. 83. On t see Ward 1962: 410; Conti 1976: 46.

⁶⁰ See Conti 1976: 24.

⁶¹ Already Cohen 1969²: 159, n° 347. See also Takács 1999a: 73-74 ; and Takács 2000: 349-350. Recently Dolgopolsky 2004: 422.

⁶² See Militarev –Kogan 2005: 105-108

⁶³ See Takács 1999a: 39.

⁶⁴ See Takács 1999a: 268.

⁶⁵ See Takács 1999a: 312-314, 316-317.

⁶⁶ See Orel – Stolbova 1995: 38-39 n° 155, and Takács 2001: 32-35.

⁶⁷ Ward 1962: 410-411.

Egyptian *wnš* “jackal”, Berber, Tuareg *ehēnši* “jackal”, Beni Sous *uššen* “jackal”, Cushitic, proto Sidamo **weš-* “dog”.⁶⁸

In fact the correspondence C.S. **t̥* ~ Egyptian *š*, that was more excluded than doubted by Cohen,⁶⁹ starting from the analysis of the Semitic Placenames Egyptian Execration Texts, it must be related more to the loanwords,⁷⁰ than to a common root. So, as in the case of C.S. *t*, the Egyptian corresponds to the C.S. **t̥* with *t*.

The correspondence C.S. **t̥* ~ Egyptian *t* seems acceptable: C.S. **AṬM*, “bone”, Egyptian *ʿt* “limb, member of body”, C.S. **ṬABY-*, “gazelle”, Egyptian *tpiw* “ox”, but likely “gazelle”.

Bibliography

- Blažek, V. 1988 “A New Contribution to Comparative Afrasian Linguistics”, AAS 24: 203-222.
- Cohen, M. 1969² *Essai comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*, Paris.
- Conti, G. 1976 “Il sistema consonantico egiziano”, OA 15:44-55.
- Conti, G. 1978 *Rapporti tra egiziano e semitico nel lessico egiziano dell'agricoltura*, QuSem 6, Firenze.
- Conti, G. 1980 *Sul bilitterismo in semitico e in egiziano. Il tema n1212*, QuSem 9, Firenze.
- Crevatin, F. 1985 “Invito all’etimologia dell’egiziano antico”, InL 10 :125-138.
- Diakonoff, I. M. 1988 *Afrasian Languages*, Moscow.
- Dolgopolsky, A. B. 2004 “Etymology of some hamito-semitic (afroasiatic) animal names”, in G. Takács (ed.), *Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam W. Lycichl*, Leiden – Köln:417-436.
- M. Franci, Problemi di Toponomastica Semitica nei Testi di Esecrazione Egiziani, Tesi di Laurea AA 2000, MS. pp. 151-154.
- Franci, M. 2010 “Estensione della radice nella comparazione egitto-semitica”, in CAMSEMUD 2007 : proceedings of the 13th Italian meeting of Afro-Asiatic linguistics. Held in Udine, May 21st-24th, 2007 - History of the ancient Near East. Monographs; 10 – edited by Frederick Mario Fales & Giulia Francesca Grassi, Udine: 87-110.
- Fronzaroli, P. 1965 “Studi sul lessico comune semitico. III I Fenomeni Naturali”, ANLR se VIII, vo. XX, fasc.3-4, Roma :xx-xx.
- Greenberg, J. H. 1954 “The Labial Consonants of Proto-Afroasiatic”, Word 14: 295-302.
- Greenberg, J. 1958 “The Labial Consonants of Proto-Afro-Asiatic”, Word 14:295-302.

⁶⁸ On the meaning of “wolf” see also Hodge 1976:11, and Cohen that suggested a comparison with Berber Sous *uššen* “jackal”, see Cohen 1969²: 199, n° 514.

⁶⁹ See Cohen 1969²: 157.

⁷⁰ Franci 2000: 151-154.

- Greenberg, J. H. 1965 "The evidence for */^mb/ as a proto-Afroasiatic phoneme", in A. Heinz – M. Karas (eds.), *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgie Kurylowicz*, Krakow: 88-92.
- Haruna, A. 1995 "On the glottalic consonants in chadic", in D. Ibriszimow – R. Leger (eds.), *Studia Chadica et Hamitosemitica*, Köln: 138-162.
- Hayward, R. J. 2000 "Afroasiatic", in B. Heine – D. Nurse (eds.), *African Languages. An Introduction*, Cambridge:74-98.
- Hodge, C. T. 1976 "An Egypto-Semitic Comparison", FO 17:5-28.
- Illič-svityč, V.M. 1966 *Iz istorii čadskogo konsonantizma: labialjnye smyčnye*, Jazyki Afriki.
- Kossmann, M. G. 1997 *Grammaire du parler Berbère de Figuig*, Paris- Louvain.
- Lacau, P. 1970 *Les noms des parties du corps en égyptien et en sémitique*, Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie, Tome XLIV, Paris.
- Loprieno, A. 1977 "A proposito delle consonanti dentali e velari in egiziano ed in semitico", AION 37/2:125-142.
- Loprieno, A. 1994 "As a summary: new tendencies in Egyptological linguistics", *Lingua Aegyptia* 4:369-382.
- Loprieno, A. 1995 *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge 1995.
- Militarev, A. Y. 1976 *O predpolagayemom prasemitiskom *p̥ (On the probable Proto-Semitic *p̥)*, *Istoriya i filologiya drevnego Vostoka*, XI Godichnaya nauchnaya sessiya.
- Militarev, A. - L. Kogan 2000, *Semitic Etymological Dictionary, Volume 1, Anatomy of Man and Animals*, AOAT 276/1, Münster.
- Militarev, A. – L. Kogan 2005 *Semitic Etymological Dictionary. Vol. II Animal Names*, Münster.
- Moscatti, S. 1969 *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Roma.
- Orel, V. 1995 "From Hamito-Semitic to Ancient Egyptian Historical Phonology", FOLH 16:143-155.
- Orel, V. – O. Stolbova 1995 *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden.
- Petraček, K. 1988 "Nochmals über die Struktur der Wurzeln mit den Pharyngalen im Altägyptischen und Semitischen und ihre Inkompabilität", in Y. L. Arbeitman (ed.), *Fucus. A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman*, Amsterdam: 371-377
- Roccati, A. 2000 "Ricerche sulla scrittura egizia – V Aporie della notazione linguistica egizia nel III e II millennio a.C.", RSO 74 :1-7.
- Roquet, G. 1973 "Incompatibiliés dans la racine en ancien égyptien", GM 6: 108-117.
- Rössler, O. 1964 "Libysch – Hamitisch – Semitisch", Oriens 17: 199-216.
- Rössler, O. 1971 "Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache", in F. Altheim - R. Stiehl, *Christentum am Roten Meer*, vo. 1, Berlin - New York : .
- Satzinger, H. 1997 "Egyptian in the Afroasiatic Frame: Recent Egyptological Issues with an Impact on Comparative Studies", in: A. Bausi, M. Tosco (eds.), *Afroasiatica Neapolitana*, Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale: 27-48.

- Schenkel, W. 1993 "Zu den Verschluss- und Reibelauten in Ägyptischen und (Hamito) Semitischen. Ein Versuch zur Synthese der Lehrmeinungen", *Lingua Aegyptia* 3:137-149.
- Stolbova, O. V. 1996 *Studies in Chadic Comparative Phonology*, Moscow.
- Svolacchia, M. 1987 "Tipologia delle ostruenti labiali in afroasiatico e implicazioni diacroniche e teoriche", *Atti della 4° giornata di studi camito-semitici*, Milano:181-193.
- Takács, G. 1997 "Selected Egypto-Afrasian correspondences from the field of anatomical terminology", in A. Bausi e M. Tosco (eds.), *Afroasiatica Neapoletana*, Napoli:225-250.
- Takács, G. 1999a *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian. Volume One A Phonological Introduction*, Köln.
- Takács, G. 1999b "Sibilant and Velar consonants of South Cushitic and their regular correspondences in Egyptian and other Afro-Asiatic branches", in Crevatin, M. - Lamberti, M. (eds.), *Afroasiatica Tergestina*, Proceedings of the 9th Italian Meeting on Afroasiatic Linguistics (Trieste 23-24 April 1998), Trieste:393-426.
- Takács, G. 2000 "Recent Problems of Egyptian Historical Phonology at the Present Stage of Comparative-Historical Afroasiatic Linguistics", in J. Lecarme – J. Lowenstamm – U. Shlonsky (eds.), *Research in Afroasiatic Grammar*, Amsterdam: 345-378.
- Titov, E.G. 1991 "On the history of the study of Semito-Hamitic Languages Family", *Semitic Studies in Honour of W. Leslau, II*, Wiesbaden:1549-1561.
- Tosco, M. 2001 *The Dhaasanac Language*, Köln.
- Voigt, R. 2002 "The Hamitic Connection", *IOS* 20: 265-290.
- Ward, W. A. 1961 "Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic", *JNES* 20:31-40.
- Ward, W. A. 1962 "Some Egypto-Semitic Roots", *OrNs* 31:397-412.
- Ward, W. A. 1985 "Reflections on Methodology in Egypto-Semitic Lexicography", in J. N. Tubb (ed.), *Palestine and the Bronze and Iron Ages, Paper in Honour of Olga Tufnell*, London: 232-248.
- Westerndorf, W. 1962 *Grammatik der medizinischen Texte*, Berlin.
- Zeidler, J. 1992 "Altägyptisch und Hamitosemitisch. Bemerkungen zu den Vergleichenden Studien von Karel Petracek", *LingAeg* 2:206-210.